Convergence actions and Specker compactifications

Clément Toromanoff

April 18, 2016

arXiv:1604.04488v1 [math.GR] 15 Apr 2016

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to generalize well-known results about discrete convergence groups to the case of locally compact groups. We first show that the action of a locally compact group on a compactum is proper on triples if and only if it satisfies a convergence property. If G is a convergence group acting on a compactum T we prove that the attractor sum $G \sqcup T$ [11] is a Specker compactification of G when T is totally disconnected. Together with a theorem due to H. Abels [2], this implies that for any minimal convergence action of G on a totally disconnected compactum T there exists a surjective G-equivariant continuous map $\mathrm{Ends}\, G \to T$. Conversely, when the group is compactly generated we show that any Specker compactification gives rise to a convergence action. Given two minimal convergence actions of a compactly generated group on totally disconnected compacta, we can then prove the existence of a minimal compactum T admitting a convergence action of G and G-equivariant continuous maps $T \to M$ and $T \to N$.

1 Introduction

A discrete group G of homeomorphisms of a metrizable compact space T is a *sequential convergence group* if every infinite sequence $(g_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of elements of G has a *collapsing* subsequence $(g_{n_i})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, i.e. there exists $a, b \in T$ (not necessarily distinct) such that for every neighborhood V of a in T and for every compact subspace $K \subseteq T \smallsetminus \{b\}$, we have $g_{n_i}(K) \subseteq V$ for i large enough (said differently, the sequence of maps $(g_{n_i|T\smallsetminus\{b\}})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges locally uniformly to the constant a). The point a is called *attractive point*, and the *limit set* ΛG of the action is the set of all attractive points.

It is mentioned in [4, 5] that a discrete group of homeomorphisms is sequential convergence if and only if its action is *properly discontinuous on triples*, i.e. for every compact subset K of the space $\mathcal{T}(T)$ of distinct triples of T, the set $\{g \in G \mid g(K) \cap K \neq \varnothing\}$ is finite. However, we have not found a complete proof of this result. This was one of the motivations of our work.

The language of sequences requests the first countability of T, whereas the proper discontinuity applies to general topological spaces. B. Bowditch showed that if one replaces "(sub)sequences" by "(sub)nets" the above equivalence is still true [5, §1]. The first aim of our paper is to prove that the above result is still true in the wider category of locally compact groups. For motivations and a history of the locally compact convergence actions see for instance the introduction of [10], more results about discrete convergence groups can be found in [5, 8, 9, 17].

By convention, locally compact spaces are Hausdorff. From now on, G is assumed to be a locally compact topological group acting continuously on a compact Hausdorff space T (*compactum* for short). We identify G with a subgroup of homeomorphisms of T and we assume that $|T| > 2$.

A net on G is *wandering* if it has no subnet converging to an element of G (see section 2 for more details about nets). Following [5], we replace collapsing sequences by collapsing nets and we say that the action of G on T is *convergence* if every wandering net on G has a collapsing subnet. In this case we also say that G is a *convergence group*. The *limit set* ΛG of the action is defined here

in the same way as above. A subset A of G is *bounded* if it is contained in a compact subspace of G. We say that the action of G on T is *3-proper* if for every compact subspace $K \subseteq \mathcal{T}(T)$ the set $\{g \in G \mid g(K) \cap K \neq \varnothing\}$ is bounded. We can now state our first result:

Theorem A (Theorem 6)**.** The action of a locally compact group G on a compactum T is convergence if and only if it is 3-proper.

Note that we do not use the group structure in the proof of this theorem, our arguments are perfectly valid if G is only assumed to be a family of homeomorphisms (cf Theorem 6). As a corollary of our arguments, we obtain the above characterization of sequential convergence: the action of a discrete group on a metrizable compact space is sequentially convergence if and only if it is properly discontinuous on triples.

We write $\cdot$ for the multiplication of G. A *quasi-Specker compactification* X of G is a compactum satisfying the following properties:

- X contains G as a dense open subset,
- the map $\left| \begin{array}{rccl} \hat{R}: & G \times X & \to & X \\ & (g,x) & \mapsto & \begin{cases} x \cdot g & \text{if } x \in G \\ x & \text{if } x \in X \smallsetminus G \end{cases} \end{array} \right.$ is continuous,
- there exists a continuous action (still denoted by $\cdot$) of G on $X \smallsetminus G$ such that the map $\left| \begin{array}{rccl} \hat{L}: & G \times X & \to & X \\ & (g,x) & \mapsto & g \cdot x \end{array} \right.$ is continuous.

When in addition the "boundary" $X \smallsetminus G$ is *totally disconnected* (i.e. its only connected subsets are the singletons) we say that X is a *Specker compactification* of G. This definition is slightly less general than the definition due to H. Abels in [2], the difference is not relevant in the cases we are interested in (see the corresponding discussion after Definitions 25).

Note that this definition does not depend on the action of G on T, note also that $\hat{L}$ (resp. $\hat{R}$) is a continuous action extending the left (resp. right) multiplications by elements of G (resp. by the identity of $X \smallsetminus G$).

Assume that G is a convergence group. Recall that the action is *minimal*, or that the group acts *minimally*, if $T = \Lambda G$. V. Gerasimov introduced in [11] a topology on the disjoint union $X = G \sqcup T$, called *attractor sum*, such that X is a compactum and to which there is a natural extension of the convergence action of G. Our next result is:

Theorem B (Theorem 21)**.** If G is a locally compact convergence group acting minimally on a compactum T then the attractor sum $X = G \sqcup T$ is a quasi-Specker compactification of G, with respect to the original action.

The following is an immediate corollary: if T is totally disconnected, the attractor sum is a (complete) Specker compactification.

Let G be an (abstract) locally compact topological group. If G acts continuously on two compacta M and N, we call *G-morphism* a G-equivariant continuous map $M \to N$.

By [2, Satz 1.8] the *end compactification* of G (in the sense of [15]), for which the boundary $E = X_E \smallsetminus G$ is the *space of ends* of G, is a Specker compactification. It is universal, i.e. for any other Specker compactification X of G there exists a surjective G-morphism (for the $\hat{L}$ actions) $f : X_E \to X$ extending the identity on G. Together with Theorem B, this implies the following:

Corollary 1. For every convergence action of G on a totally disconnected compactum T, there exists a G-morphism $E \to T$. If the action is minimal then the morphism is surjective.

Assume that G acts continuously with convergence property on a compactum T. Let T' be the quotient space of T obtained by collapsing its connected components to points. We show that the induced action of G on T' is also convergence and that the canonical map $T \to T'$ is a surjective G-morphism (Lemma 16). Corollary 1 implies then the following generalization of a result of R. S. Kulkarni [14] to the locally compact case (note that we do not require the group to be finitely or compactly generated):

Corollary 2. If a locally compact group admits a minimal convergence action on a space having more than two components then the group has infinitely many ends.

Our next result deals with *compactly generated* groups:

Theorem C (Corollary 35)**.** Let G be a locally compact and compactly generated topological group. If X is a Specker compactification of G then the action of G on X is convergence and its limit set is $X \smallsetminus G$.

Let us consider the family of all totally disconnected compacta on which G acts minimally with convergence property, partially ordered by the surjective G-morphisms. When G is compactly generated Theorem C strengthens Corollary 1, stating that this family has a maximal element, the set of ends of G.

Following V. Gerasimov and L. Potyagailo [12], we call *pullback* of two minimal convergence actions of G on compacta M and N a triple (T, π_M, π_N) where T is a compactum on which G acts minimally with convergence property and $\pi_M : T \to M$ and $\pi_N : T \to N$ are G-morphisms. A pullback (T, π_M, π_N) is *minimal* if for any other pullback (T', π'_M, π'_N) there exists a G-morphism $\phi : T' \to T$ such that $\pi_M \circ \phi = \pi'_M$ and $\pi_N \circ \phi = \pi'_N$. Using our previous results we show the following:

Theorem D (Theorem 37)**.** Let G be a compactly generated group acting minimally with convergence property on two totally disconnected compacta. There exists a minimal pullback of these actions.

Note that Theorem C and Theorem D are not true if we omit the totally disconnectedness property (or if we replace "Specker" by "quasi-Specker"). A counterexample is due to [12], see the discussion at the end of Section 7.

Structure of the paper

Section 2 of our paper provides topological preliminaries, especially the definition and basic properties of the nets. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem A in the case of a family of homeomorphisms. In section 4 we prove standard properties of the limit set of convergence groups in the locally compact case (Proposition 15), we then obtain convergence actions on totally disconnected compacta (Lemma 16). In section 5 we give the construction of the attractor sum and prove Theorem B. In section 6 we recall Abels' classification of the Specker compactifications of a given group (Propositon 27). In section 7 we prove that the action of a compactly generated group on a Specker compactification is convergence, this yields Theorem C and D.

Acknowledgements

This paper was written during my doctoral thesis, I am grateful to my director Leonid Potyagailo for patiently listening to me and giving me advices. This work was supported in part by the Labex CEMPI (ANR-11-LABX-0007-01).

2 Preliminaries

In the whole section we fix a topological space X. For all $x \in X$, we denote with $\mathcal{N}_X(x)$ the family of all (not necessarily open) neighborhoods of x in X. Recall that a **local basis** at a point $x \in X$ is a subfamily $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{N}_X(x)$ such that any neighborhood of x contains a member of $\mathcal{B}$. The topological spaces that we consider will always be Hausdorff and locally compact, so that the family of compact neighborhoods of any point is a local basis at this point. In such spaces, distinct points admit disjoint compact neighborhoods.

It is convenient for us to work with "nets", which we define below. This notion is equivalent to the notion of filter (to every net we can associate a filter with the same convergence properties and conversely), we believe it is easier to describe the dynamical properties of convergence using nets.

Definitions 1.

- A couple $(D, \geqslant)$ where D is a set and $\geqslant$ is a transitive reflexive relation on D is a **directed set** if for all $n, m \in D$ there exists $p \in D$ such that $p \geqslant n$ and $p \geqslant m$.
- A property P defined of a directed set $(D, \geqslant)$ is true **for n large enough** if there exists $m \in D$ such that whenever $n \in D$ satisfies $n \geqslant m$ we have $P(n)$.
- A **net** on X is a map $z : D \to X$ where D is a directed set, we will write it $(z_n)_{n \in D}$ or simply $(z_n)_n$. We also say that the net is on a subset A of X if $z_n \in A$ for all n.
- A net $(z_n)_n$ on X **converges** to a point $x \in X$ (we write then $z_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} x$) if for all $U \in \mathcal{N}_X(x)$, $z_n \in U$ for n large enough. The point x is then the **limit** of the net $(z_n)_n$.
- A net $(y_e)_{e \in E}$ is a **subnet** of a net $(z_d)_{d \in D}$ if there exists a map $N : E \to D$ such that $y = z \circ N$ (i.e. $\forall e \in E,\ y_e = z_{N(e)}$) and such that for all $d \in D$ we have $N(e) \geqslant d$ for e large enough. We will often not need to explicit the map N and we will write the subnet $(z_e)_e$ rather than $(z_{N(e)})_{e \in E}$.
- Let $(z_n)_n$ be a net on X. A point $x \in X$ is a **cluster point** of $(z_n)_n$ if there exists a subnet of $(z_n)_n$ converging to x. The net $(z_n)_n$ is **wandering** if it has no cluster point.

Remarks 2.

- Let $(z_n)_n$ be a net on X and let P be a property on elements of X. The assertion "$P(z_n)$ for n large enough" is false if and only if there exists a subnet $(z_i)_i$ such that $P(z_i)$ is false for all i.
- If $(z_n)_n$ and $(u_n)_n$ are two nets defined on the same directed set, a subnet $(z_i)_i$ of $(z_n)_n$ naturally induces a subnet $(u_i)_i$ of $(u_n)_n$. More generally, when we use same indices we mean that the domain is the same.

Recall that a subset of X is **bounded** if it is contained in a compact subsace of X.

Proposition 3. Let A be a subset of X.

- The subset A is closed if and only if for every net on A converging to a point $x \in X$ we have $x \in A$.
- The closure of A in X is the set of all $x \in X$ such that there exists a net $(a_n)_n$ on A satisfying $a_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} x$ in X ; A is dense in X if and only if every point of X is the limit of a net on A.
- A map $f : X \to Y$ (where Y is a topological space) is continuous on X (resp. at a point $x \in X$) if and only if for every net on X converging to some $x \in X$ (resp. to x), the net $(f(x_n))_n$ converges to $f(x)$.

- The subset A is compact if and only if every net on A has a cluster point in A.
- When X is locally compact, the subset A is not bounded if and only if there exists a wandering net on A.

Proof. The first points are classical (see [13] for instance), let us show the last one. If A is a bounded subset of X, there exists a compact subset $K \subseteq X$ containing A so that every net on A has a cluster point in K hence in X. Assume now that X is locally compact and that $A \subseteq X$ is not bounded. For every compact subset $K \subseteq X$, there exists then a point $a_K \in A \smallsetminus K$, and as the family of compact subsets endowed with reverse inclusion is a directed set, $(a_K)_K$ is a net on A. As every $x \in X$ has a compact neighborhood any subnet $(a_L)_L$ will be outside this neighborhood for L large enough hence cannot converge to x, so that the net $(a_K)_K$ is wandering. □

In the whole paper $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of a set A, and $\mathring{A}$ (resp. $\bar{A}$) denotes the interior (resp. the closure) of a subset A of a topological space.

3 Convergence property and 3-properness

In this section we prove Theorem A in the case of a family of homeomorphisms (Theorem 6). This result is divided in two implications: Propositions 8 and 11. We try to keep the same terminology as in [5, §1] where the equivalence is proved in the case when the family is discrete. Beware that Bowditch's proposition 1.1 is a priori not true as it stands (all the other results involving nets are perfectly valid). It is also interesting to compare the main result of this section to [10, 5.3, Proposition P] in the case $n = 2$.

We end the section with considerations on the particular case of a discrete family acting on a metrizable compact space.

In the whole section, we fix two compacta M and N and a family Φ of homeomorphisms $M \to N$, equipped with the structure of a locally compact topological space.

For $X = M$ or $X = N$, recall that $\mathcal{T}(X)$ denotes the subspace $\{(x, y, z) \in X^3 \mid x \neq y \neq z \neq x\}$ of X^3 (it is the space of distinct triples of X), it is a locally compact Hausdorff space. We note $\phi(x, y, z) = (\phi(x), \phi(y), \phi(z))$ for all $\phi \in \Phi$ and all $(x, y, z) \in M^3$.

We will repeatedly use the fact that any net in a compact space has a converging subnet and use formulations such as "up to passing to a subnet, we can assume that the net converges". Note that a subnet of a converging (resp. wandering) net is still converging (resp. wandering).

Definition 4. The action of Φ is **proper on triples**, or **3-proper**, if for all compact subsets $K \subseteq \mathcal{T}(M)$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}(N)$ the set $\{\phi \in \Phi \mid \phi(K) \cap L \neq \varnothing\}$ is bounded.

When Φ is discrete, the bounded subsets of Φ are its finite subsets and the usual terminology is **properly discontinuous on triples**.

Note that we didn't assume the action $\Phi \times M \to N$ to be continuous so that the set $\{\phi \mid \phi(K) \cap L \neq \varnothing\}$ is not necessarily closed.

Definitions 5.

- A net $(\phi_n)_n$ on Φ is **collapsing** if there exists $a \in M$ and $b \in N$ such that for every compact subset $K \subseteq M \smallsetminus \{a\}$ and every neighborhood $U \in \mathcal{N}_N(b)$, we have $\phi_n(K) \subseteq U$ for n large enough. In this case, we write $\phi_{n|(M \smallsetminus \{a\})} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} b$.
- The family Φ has **convergence property** if every wandering net on Φ has a collapsing subnet.

In this context, Theorem A can be written as follows:

Theorem 6. The action of Φ is 3-proper if and only if the family Φ has the convergence property.

One direction of the equivalence is easy, we need first to rephrase the 3-properness property in terms of nets.

Lemma 7. The action of Φ is not 3-proper if and only if there exists $(x,y,z) \in \mathcal{T}(N)$, $(x',y',z') \in \mathcal{T}(M)$, a wandering net $(\phi_n)_n$ on Φ and a net $(x_n,y_n,z_n)_n$ on M^3 such that

$$(x_n,y_n,z_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} (x,y,z) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_n(x_n,y_n,z_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} (x',y',z').$$

In the situation of the lemma, we say that the net $(\phi_n,x_n,y_n,z_n)_n$ **contradicts 3-properness** (the triples (x,y,z) and (x',y',z') are implicit, this shouldn't be confusing).

Proof. If $K \subseteq \mathcal{T}(M)$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}(N)$ are compact subsets and if $A = \{\phi \in \Phi \mid \phi(K) \cap L \neq \varnothing\}$ is not bounded, there exists a wandering net $(\phi_d)_d$ on A, hence a net $(x_d,y_d,z_d)_d$ on K such that $(\phi_d(x_d,y_d,z_d))_d$ is a net on L, compacity implies existence of subnets $(x_e,y_e,z_e)_e$ and $(\phi_e(x_e,y_e,z_e))_e$ converging respectively to $(x,y,z) \in K \subseteq \mathcal{T}(M)$ and $(x',y',z') \in L \subseteq \mathcal{T}(N)$, and then $(\phi_e,x_e,y_e,z_e)_e$ contradicts 3-properness.

Conversely, if $(\phi_n,x_n,y_n,z_n)_n$ is a net contradicting 3-properness, as $\mathcal{T}(M)$ and $\mathcal{T}(N)$ are locally compact there exists compact neighborhoods K of (x,y,z) and L of (x',y',z'), the net convergence implies then that $(x_n,y_n,z_n) \in K$ and $\phi_n(x_n,y_n,z_n) \in L$ for n large enough, we deduce that $\phi_n(K) \cap L \neq \varnothing$, but $(\phi_n)_n$ is wandering so that $\{\phi \in \Phi \mid \phi(K) \cap L \neq \varnothing\}$ isn't bounded. □

Proposition 8. If the family Φ has the convergence property then its action is 3-proper.

Proof. Arguing by contradiction, assume that Φ has convergence property and let $(\phi_n,x_n,y_n,z_n)_n$ be a net contradicting 3-properness. Up to passing to a subnet and permuting x, y and z, we can assume that there exists points $a \in M$ and $b \in N$ such that $\phi_{n|(M\smallsetminus\{a\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} b$, $x \neq a$ and $y \neq a$. If $x' \neq b$, there exists disjoint neighborhoods $U \in \mathcal{N}_N(x')$ and $V \in \mathcal{N}_N(b)$, and as $x \neq a$ there exists a compact neighborhood K of x contained in $M \smallsetminus \{a\}$, but then the collapsing property gives $\phi_n(K) \subseteq V$ for n large enough and the convergence of $(x_n)_n$ and $(\phi_n(x_n))_n$ gives $\phi_n(K) \cap U \neq \varnothing$ for n large enough, which is not possible. We deduce that $x' = b$, and the same argument gives $y' = b$ so that $(x',y',z') \notin \mathcal{T}(N)$, this is a contradiction. □

In the remainder of the section, we assume that the action of Φ is 3-proper.

Lemma 9. Let $(v_n)_n$ be a net on N and let a,b be distincts points in N. We write $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$ for the assertion "for all $U \in \mathcal{N}_N(a)$ and $V \in \mathcal{N}_N(b)$, we have $v_n \in U \cup V$ for n large enough".

- If $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$ and if $v \in N$ satisfies $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} v$, then $v \in \{a,b\}$.
- If $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$ and if $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} a$, then a subnet $(v_i)_i$ satisfies $v_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} b$.
- If $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} \{a,b\}$, then a subnet of $(v_n)_n$ converges to a point in $N \smallsetminus \{a,b\}$.

Proof. Assume first that $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$. If $(v_n)_n$ converges to a point $v \in N \smallsetminus \{a,b\}$, there exists a neighborhood V of v whose complement is a neighborhood of a and b, but then $v_n \in W$ for n large enough, hence $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$. If moreover $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} a$, a subnet $(v_i)_i$ stays outside some neighborhood of a, and by definition we get $v_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} b$.

If $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} \{a,b\}$, a subnet $(v_i)_i$ stays outside some neighborhood of a and b, up to passing to a subnet again we can assume that $(v_i)_i$ converges to a point in M, and necessarily this point is distinct from a and b. □

Lemma 10. Let us fix a triple $(x,y,z) \in \mathcal{T}(M)$, two distinct points $a,b \in N$, a wandering net $(\phi_n)_n$ on Φ and three nets $(x_n)_n$, $(y_n)_n$ and $(z_n)_n$ on M. We assume that $(x_n,y_n,z_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} (x,y,z)$ and that $\phi_n(x_n,y_n,z_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} (a,a,b) \in N^3$.

1. If $(v_n)_n$ is a net on M converging to point $v \in M \setminus \{z\}$ then $\phi_n(v_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$.
2. If $(v_n)_n$ is a net on M converging to a point $v \in M \setminus \{x,y,z\}$ then $(\phi_n(v_n))_n$ can only converge to a.
3. If $x_n = x$ and $y_n = y$ for all n then $\phi_{n|(M\setminus\{z\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} a$.

Proof. Let $v \in M \setminus \{z\}$ and let $(v_n)_n$ be a net converging to v. If $\phi_n(v_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\not\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$, there exists a point $c \in N \setminus \{a,b\}$ and a subnet $(v_i)_i$ such that $\phi_i(v_i) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} c$, exchanging x and y if needed we can assume that $v \neq x$, but then $(\phi_i,x_i,z_i,v_i)_i$ contradicts 3-properness. We deduce the first point.

Assume now that there exists $v \in M \setminus \{x,y,z\}$, $l \in N \setminus \{a\}$ and a net $(v_n)_n$ on M such that $v_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} v$ and $\phi_n(v_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} l$. First point gives $\phi_n(v_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$ and by the previous proposition $l = b$. Choose now some $c \in N \setminus \{a,b\}$ and let $u_n = \phi_n^{-1}(c)$ for all n. Up to passing to a subnet, we can assume that $u_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} u$ for some $u \in M$, but if we choose $\zeta \in \{x,y\} \setminus \{u\}$ and $\xi \in \{z,v\} \setminus \{u\}$, we get that the net $(\phi_n,\zeta_n,\xi_n,u_n)_n$ contradicts 3-properness. We have the second point.

Assume that $x_n = x$ and $y_n = y$ for all n. We first show pointwise convergence: let $v \in M \setminus \{z\}$. First point gives $\phi_n(v) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \{a,b\}$, and if $\phi_n(v) \underset{n\to\infty}{\not\longrightarrow} a$, some subnet $(\phi_i(v))_i$ converges to b, but $\phi_i(x) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} a$, $\phi_i(y) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} a$ and $a \neq b$ gives $v \in M \setminus \{x,y,z\}$, in contradiction with the second point. We deduce that $\phi_n(v) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} a$.

Assume that $\phi_{n|(M\setminus\{z\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\not\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} a$: there exists a compact $K \subseteq M \setminus \{z\}$, a neighborhood $U \in \mathcal{N}_N(a)$ a subnet $(\phi_i)_i$ such that $\phi_i(K) \cap C \neq \varnothing$ for all i. We can assume that $C = N \setminus U$ is compact, hence there exists a net $(v_i)_i$ on K such that $\phi_i(k_i) \in C$ for all i, and up to passing to a subnet we can assume that $v_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} v$ and $\phi_i(v_i) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} u$ for a point $v \in M \setminus \{z\}$ and a point $u \in N \setminus \{a\}$. Up to changing x or y for an other point $p \in M \setminus \{z\}$ (we still have $\phi_i(p) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} a$ by pointwise convergence), we can assume that $v \in M \setminus \{x,y,z\}$, and the second point gives a contradiction. □

We can now conclude:

Proposition 11. If the action of Φ is 3-proper then the family Φ has the convergence property.

Proof. Let $(\phi_n)_n$ be a wandering on Φ and choose an arbitrary $(x,y,z) \in \mathcal{T}(M)$. As Φ acts 3-properly, up to permuting x, y and z there exists $a,b \in N$ and a subnet $(\phi_i)_i$ such that $\phi_i(x,y,z) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} (a,a,b)$. If $a \neq b$, the last point of the previous proposition gives $\phi_{i|(M\setminus\{z\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} a$. If $a = b$, pick a point $c \in N \setminus \{a\}$ and let $u_i = \phi_i^{-1}(c)$ for all i, up to passing to a subnet we can assume that $u_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} u$ for some $u \in M$. By construction $\phi_i(u_i) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} c \neq a$, but we can choose two distincts points in $\{x,y,z\} \setminus \{u\}$, and we get $\phi_{i|(M\setminus\{u\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} a$ as earlier. □

We want now to consider a particular case. Note first that Theorem 6 is still valid if Φ is assumed to be discrete or if M and N are assumed to be metrizable.

We will use a "lighter" definition of the convergence property, using sequences rather than nets. Note that a sequence is a net so that "collapsing sequence" makes sense.

We say that the family Φ has the **sequential convergence property** if every infinite sequence on Φ has a collapsing subsequence. In a general context this property neither implies nor is implied by the (net) convergence property. Even so it seems to be regarded as true, there is no complete proof of the following result (see [4, 5]):

Corollary 12 (of the proof of Theorem 6)**.** Let M and N be two metrizable compact spaces and let Φ be a discrete family of homeomorphisms $M \to N$. The action of Φ is properly discontinuous on triples if and only if the family Φ has the sequential convergence property.

Proof. Recall that a metric space X is compact if and only if every sequence on X has a converging subsequence and note that in a discrete space wandering and infinite sequences "almost" coincide.

Now, if M and N are metrizable and if Φ is discrete, we can replace all occurences of "(sub)net" by "(sub)sequence" in the whole section and get a proof of the corollary. □

4 First properties of a convergence group

We show in this section that classical results about the limit set of a convergence group extend to the locally compact case. We also prove a lemma producing convergence action on totally disconnected compacta.

Let T be a compactum and let G be a locally compact topological group acting **continuously** on T. For all $g \in G$ the map $\tilde{g} : t \mapsto g \cdot t$ is then a homeomorphism of T.

Definition 13. The action of G on T is **convergence**, or the group G is a (locally compact) **convergence group**, if every wandering net $(g_n)_n$ on G has a subnet $(g_i)_i$ such that the net $(\tilde{g}_i)_i$ of homeomorphisms of T is collapsing (see Definitions 5).

Note that there are subtleties compared to the previous section. One would simply want to say "every wandering net on G (or on $\tilde{G} = \{\tilde{g} \mid g \in G\}$) has a collapsing subnet", but the sets G and $\tilde{G}$ do not have the same structure "a priori". If the topology on $\tilde{G}$ is chosen in a way such that the map $g \mapsto \tilde{g}$ is continuous and proper (the preimage of any compact set is compact) then the convergence property of $\tilde{G}$ and of the action of G are equivalent. If the topology on $\tilde{G}$ is the compact-open topology then the hypothesis "$G \times T \to T$ continuous" is redundant (see [10, 4.2] and [13, Chapter 7] for more details).

In the whole section, we assume that G is a convergence group and we identify an element $g \in G$ with the homeomorphism $\tilde{g}$.

Definitions 14.

- The action is **proper** at a point $t \in T$ if there exists a neighborhood $V \in \mathcal{N}_T(t)$ such that the set $\{g \in G \mid g \cdot V \cap V \neq \varnothing\}$ is bounded. The **ordinary set** of the action is the set of all points of T where the action is proper.
- The **limit set** of the action is the set of **attractive points** of the action, i.e.:

$$\Lambda = \{u \in T \mid \exists v \in T,\ \exists (g_n)_n \text{ net on } G \text{ such that } g_{n|(T\setminus\{v\})} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} u\}.$$

- The action is **elementary** either if $|\Lambda| \leqslant 2$ or if there exists $t \in T$ such that $g \cdot t = t$ for all $g \in G$.
- The action is **minimal** if $\Lambda = T$.

Note that Λ is empty if and only if G is compact, we will see that if $\Lambda = \{\lambda\}$ then $G \cdot \{\lambda\} = \{\lambda\}$ so that there exists a point fixed by all elements of G.

In the discrete case all elementary groups are classified [9, §5]. It is then natural to ask what happens in the locally compact case. If G is compactly generated and if Λ has exactly two points, the structure of G is simple (see [6, Cor 4.D.2], using H. Abels' generalization [2, §4] of J. Stallings' structure theorem in [16]), in the other cases the question is still open.

Proposition 15.

- The limit set Λ of the action is a closed G-invariant subset of T and we have $\Lambda = T \setminus \Omega$.
- The restriction of the action of G on Λ is convergence and minimal.
- If the action is non elementary, the limit set Λ is the smallest non-empty closed and G-invariant subset of T.
- If $|\Lambda| \geqslant 3$ then Λ is perfect (hence infinite).

Proof. Recall that for all $t \in T$, a subset $K \subseteq T \setminus \{t\}$ is compact if and only if the set $T \setminus K$ is an (open) neighborhood of t in T. As the action is continuous, the definition of a collapsing net gives then the equivalence between "$g_{n|(T\setminus\{v\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$", "$(g \cdot g_n)_{|(T\setminus\{v\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} g \cdot u$" and "$g_n^{-1}{}_{|(T\setminus\{u\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} v$" for all $u, v \in T$, for all $g \in G$ and for every (wandering) net $(g_n)_n$ on G. We deduce that Λ is G-invariant and coincides with the set of **repulsive points** of G in T, i.e. the set of points $u \in T$ such that there exists a point $v \in T$ and a wandering net $(g_n)_n$ on G satisfying $g_{n|(T\setminus\{u\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} v$.

Let us now show that $\Lambda = T \setminus \Omega$, as a consequence Λ will be closed, Ω being open by construction.

First, let $\lambda \in \Lambda$: there exists $\mu \in T$ and a wandering net $(g_n)_n$ on G such that $g_{n|(T\setminus\{\mu\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} \lambda$. If λ is isolated, i.e. $\{\lambda\} \in \mathcal{N}_T(\lambda)$, we see that T cannot have more than two points. We deduce the last point and we assume in the following that $|T| \geqslant 3$. Let then $V \in \mathcal{N}_T(\lambda)$, there exists a point $v \in V \setminus \{\lambda, \mu\}$, and as $g_n \cdot v \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda$, we have $g_n \cdot V \cap V \neq \varnothing$ for n large enough. As the net $(g_n)_n$ is wandering, the set $\{g \in G \mid g \cdot V \cap V \neq \varnothing\}$ is not bounded hence $\lambda \in T \setminus \Omega$.

Let then $\lambda \in T \setminus \Omega$. For every neighborhood $V \in \mathcal{N}_T(\lambda)$ and every compact subset $K \subseteq G$ there exists then $v = v(V, K) \in V$ and $g_v \in G \setminus K$ such that $g_v \cdot v \in V$. By construction the net $(g_v)_{(V,K)}$ is wandering so that there exists points $u, v \in T$ and a subnet $(g_i)_i$ satisfying $g_{i|(T\setminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$, and as $v_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} v$ and $g_i \cdot v_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} v$ also by construction we deduce that $\lambda \in \{u, v\}$ and that $\lambda \in \Lambda$. We have the first point, the second one is then easy.

Assume now that the action is non elementary. We show first that $\Lambda \subseteq \overline{G \cdot \{t\}}$ for any $t \in T$. Fix then a point $t \in T$, by assumption there exists $g \in G$ such that $g \cdot t \neq t$. Let then $\lambda \in \Lambda$, there exists $\mu \in T$ and a wandering net $(g_n)_n$ such that $g_{n|(T\setminus\{\mu\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} \lambda$, and as $t \neq \mu$ or $g \cdot t \neq \mu$ we have $g_n \cdot t \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda$ or $g_n \cdot g \cdot t \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda$, in both cases $\lambda \in \overline{G \cdot \{t\}}$. If now F is a closed G-invariant subset of T, picking any $f \in F$ we get $\Lambda \subseteq \overline{G \cdot \{f\}} \subseteq F$. We deduce the third point. □

Our next lemma will be used to get convergence actions on totally disconnected spaces.

Let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation "belong to the same connected component" on T, we endow the quotient space $T' = T/\sim$ with the quotient topology and write $\pi : T \to T'$ the canonical projection.

Lemma 16. The space T' (**space of connected components** of T) is a totally disconnected compactum. The formula $g \cdot \pi(t) = \pi(g \cdot t)$ induces a well-defined action of G on T'. This action is continuous and convergence, it is also minimal if the action of G on T is minimal.

Note that $\pi : T \to T'$ is continuous, surjective and G-equivariant by construction.

Proof. The space T' is totally disconnected by construction, it is compact because T is compact and it is Hausdorff because T is a compactum so that its components and quasi-components coincide (see [3]).

For all $g \in G$ the map $\tilde{g}$ is a homeomorphism of T hence maps components to components so that the map $(g, \pi(t)) \mapsto \pi(g \cdot t)$ is well defined, we easily check that it is an action of G on T'.

We first show that the action is continuous. By contradiction assume that there exists two points $g \in G$ and $t' \in T'$ and two nets $(g_n)_n$ and $(t'_n)_n$ on G and T' respectively such that $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} g$ and $t'_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t'$ but $g_n \cdot t'_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\not\longrightarrow} g \cdot t'$. There exists a net $(t_n)_n$ on T such that $\pi(t_n) = t'_n$ for all n, and up to passing to a subnet we can assume that there exists $t \in T$ such that $t_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$. As the action of G on T

and the projection π are continuous we have $g_n \cdot t'_n = g_n \cdot \pi(t_n) = \pi(g_n \cdot t_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \pi(g \cdot t) = g \cdot \pi(t) = g \cdot t'$, a contradiction.

Let then $(g_n)_n$ be a net on G, we assume that there exists $a, b \in T$ satisfying $g_{n|(T\smallsetminus\{b\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} a$ and we show that $g_{n|(T'\smallsetminus\{\pi(b)\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} \pi(a)$ (the elements of G being seen as homeomorphisms of T or T'). Let $V \in \mathcal{N}_{T'}(\pi(a))$ and let K be a compact subset of $T'\smallsetminus\{\pi(b)\}$. On one hand $\pi^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{N}_T(a)$ and on the other hand $\pi^{-1}(K)$ is closed hence compact and contained in $T \smallsetminus \{b\}$ so that $g_n \cdot (\pi^{-1}(K)) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(V)$ for n large enough. As π is surjective we have $g_n \cdot K = g_n \cdot \pi(\pi^{-1}(K)) = \pi(g_n \cdot \pi^{-1}(K) \subseteq \pi(\pi^{-1}(V)) \subseteq V$ for n large enough.

In other words, collapsing nets "relatively to T" are also collapsing "relatively to T'" so that the convergence property for the action on T gives the convergence property for the action on T'.

If Λ' denotes the limit set of the action on T', the previous fact also shows that $\pi(\Lambda) \subseteq \Lambda'$. When the action of G on T is minimal we deduce that $\Lambda' = T'$, the action of G on T' is minimal. □

5 Convergence actions are Specker compactifications

We show in this section that any convergence action of a locally compact group G on a compactum T induces a quasi-Specker compactification of G.

More precisely, we first define a topology on the union $X = G \sqcup T$ which extends the original topologies of G and T, it is the attractor sum. We then show that the space X is a compactum (Proposition 18) and that the right and left translations extend on X as required (Theorem 20), this yields Theorem B. We then prove shortly that the action of G on the attractor sum is convergence (Proposition 23) and we end the section with a lemma allowing to extend G-equivariant maps on attractor sums.

The topology on X is a construction of V. Gerasimov [11, §8], our propositions 18 and 23 can be seen as consequences of these results. We believe that our methods with (collapsing) nets give an other point of view on the attractor sum.

Let G be a locally compact convergence group acting on a compactum T. We denote with $\cdot$ both the multiplication in G and the action of G on T, so that $g \cdot x$ makes sense for $x \in G$ or $x \in T$ (where $g \in G$). We also assume that G is not compact, there exists then wandering nets on G.

For any net $(g_n)_n$ on G and any subset $H \subseteq G$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(g_n)_n &= \{u \in T \mid \exists v \in T,\ \exists (g_i)_i \text{ subnet of } (g_n)_n :\ g_{i|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u\} \\ \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}(H) &= \{u \in T \mid \exists v \in T,\quad \exists (g_i)_i \text{ net on } H :\quad g_{i|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u\} \end{aligned}$$

be the sets of **attractor points** of $(g_n)_n$ and H in T.

Definition-Proposition 17. Let X be the formal disjoint union $X = G \sqcup T$.

We say that a subset $P \subseteq X$ is closed if it satisfies the following properties:

- $G \cap P$ is closed in G,
- $T \cap P$ is closed in T,
- $\mathcal{A}(G \cap P) \subseteq T \cap P$.

The family of closed subsets induces the structure of a topological space on X. We call this space the **attractor sum** of G and X (relatively to the action). In this space G is an open subset and T is a closed subset, moreover the topologies of G and T as subspaces coincide with their initial ones.

Proof. We easily check that $\mathcal{A}(H_1 \cup H_2) = \mathcal{A}(H_1) \cup \mathcal{A}(H_2)$ for all subsets $H_1, H_2 \subseteq G$ and that $\mathcal{A}(\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i) \subseteq \bigcap_{i\in I} \mathcal{A}(H_i)$ for any family $(H_i)_{i\in I}$ of subsets of G, we deduce that we have a topology on X.

For every closed subset $F \subseteq G$, we check that $F \cup T$ is closed in X, hence every open subset of G (for instance G) is open in X, and as $\mathcal{A}(\varnothing) = \varnothing$ any closed subset of T is also closed in X. □

Note that if $|T| = 1$ (resp. $|T| = 2$) then X is the Alexandroff compactification of G (resp. where the point at infinity is doubled).

From now on, we assume that $|T| \geqslant 3$ and we fix a subset $\xi \subseteq T$ of cardinality 3.

Using a slight abuse of notation, we will say that a net $(g_n)_n$ on X such that $g_n \in G$ for all n is **wandering** if it has no cluster point in G (i.e. seen as a net on G it is a wandering net). As X will be compact, a wandering net on X will always have cluster points in X.

Proposition 18.

- The space X is a compactum.
- For every net $(g_n)_n$ on G and for all $t \in T$, we have $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$ in X if and only if $(g_n)_n$ is wandering and $\mathcal{A}(g_n)_n = \{t\}$.

Note that the second point gives the two following facts:

- if $(g_n)_n$ is a net on G and if there exists $t, u \in T$ such that $g_{n|(T\smallsetminus\{u\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} t$ then $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$ (and $g_n^{-1} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} u$) in X,
- the set of accumulation points of G in T is exactly the limit set of the action so that G is dense in X if and only if the action is minimal.

Proof. We first show that X is Hausdorff. Let p and q be distinct points of X, we distinguish three cases:

- Case 1: $p, q \in G$. As G is Hausdorff and open in X we can find disjoint neighborhoods of p and q in G hence in X.
- Case 2: $p \in G$ and $q \in T$. Let us pick a compact (hence closed) neighborhood $K \in \mathcal{N}_G(p)$, then K is a neighborhood of p in X, closed in X because $\mathcal{A}(K) = \varnothing$, hence $X \smallsetminus K$ is a neighborhood of q in X disjoint to K.
- Case 3: $p, q \in T$. We need some preliminaries.

  For every subset $A \subseteq T$ let $\xi A = \{g \in G \mid |A \cap g \cdot \xi| \geqslant 2\}$ and $\xi^+ A = A \cup \xi A$. We easily check that ξ and ξ^+ commutes with the complement (in G or in X respectively) and that for all disjoint subsets A and B of G the subsets $\xi^+ A$ and $\xi^+ B$ of X are still disjoint. We now want to show that ξ^+ preserves the property of being open (or closed). Let then A be a closed subset of T. Firstly, note that $T \cap \xi^+ A = A$ is closed in T. Secondly, let $(g_n)_n$ be a net on $G \cap \xi^+ A = \xi A$ converging to a point $g \in G$, we show that $g \in \xi A$. For all n we have $|A \cap g_n \cdot \xi| \geqslant 2$ and as ξ is finite and A is compact, up to passing to a subnet we can assume that there exists distinct points x_1 and x_2 in ξ such that $g_n \cdot x_1 \in A$ and $g_n \cdot x_2 \in A$ for all n, and that there exists points $a_1, a_2 \in A$ such that $g_n \cdot x_1 \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} a_1$ and $g_n \cdot x_2 \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} a_2$. As the action of G on T is continuous, $g \cdot x_1 = a_1 \in A$ and $g \cdot x_2 = a_2 \in A$ hence $g \in \xi A$. We deduce that ξA is closed in G. Finally, if there exists $u \in \mathcal{A}(\xi A) \smallsetminus A$, there exists $v \in T$ and a net $(g_n)_n$ on ξA such that $g_{n|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} u$, and as $X \smallsetminus A \in \mathcal{N}_X(u)$, we have $g_n(\xi \smallsetminus \{v\}) \subseteq X \smallsetminus A$ for n large enough, but $|\xi \smallsetminus \{v\}| \geqslant 2$ is in contradiction with $g_n \in \xi A$ for all n. We deduce that $\mathcal{A}(\xi A) \subseteq A$, and we conclude that $\xi^+ A$ is closed in X.

Now, if O_p and O_q are disjoint open neighborhoods of p and q in T then ξ^+O_p and ξ^+O_q are disjoint open subsets of X containing p and q.

We show then the second point: let $(g_n)_n$ be a net on G and let $t \in T$.

Let us first assume that $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$ in X. As X is Hausdorff and G is open in X the net $(g_n)_n$ is wandering, and by the convergence property $\mathcal{A}(g_n)_n \neq \varnothing$. For $r \in T \setminus \{t\}$, there exists an open neighborhood $O_r \in \mathcal{N}_X(r)$ such that $F_r = X \setminus O_r$ belongs to $\mathcal{N}_X(t)$. On one hand F_r is closed in X so that $\mathcal{A}(G \cap F_r) \subseteq T \cap F_r$ (which does not contain r), one the other hand $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$ in X then $g_n \in G \cap F_r$ for n large enough, we deduce that $r \notin \mathcal{A}(g_n)_n$. Finally we can only have $\mathcal{A}(g_n)_n = \{t\}$.

Conversely, assume that $(g_n)_n$ is wandering and that $\mathcal{A}(g_n)_n = \{t\}$. For every open neighborhood $O \in \mathcal{N}_X(t)$, the complement $F = X \setminus O$ is closed in X so that $\mathcal{A}(G \cap F) \subseteq T \cap F$ (which does not contain t), hence there is no subnet of $(g_n)_n$ on $G \cap F$, and this means exactly that $g_n \in G \setminus F \subseteq O$ for n large enough. We deduce that $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$ in X.

We can now show that X is compact: let $(x_n)_n$ be a net on X. Up to passing to a subnet, we limit the proof to the two following cases. First case: $x_n \in T$ for all n. As T is compact the net has a cluster point in T and it is also a cluster point in X. Second case: $x_n \in G$ for all n. There are two subcases, either the net has a cluster point in G and this is again a cluster point in X, or the net is wandering and by the convergence property there exists a subnet $(x_i)_i$ and points $u, v \in T$ such that $x_{i|(T\setminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} u$, and by the previous point we have $x_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} u$ in X. In all cases, we have found a cluster point of $(x_n)_n$, we conclude that X is compact. □

The following example shows that a not-collapsing net on G can converge to a point in T.

Example 19. Consider the case when T is the extended complex plane $\hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \sqcup \{\infty\}$ and G is the group of Möbius transformations. Let $D = [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{N}$ and let us say that $(r, m) \geqslant (t, n)$ if $m \geqslant n$, we easily see that $(D, \geqslant)$ is directed so that $(g_t^n : z \mapsto 2^n z + (1 - 2^n)t)_{(t,n)\in D}$ is a net. This net is wandering and satisfies $\mathcal{A}(g_t^n)_{(t,n)} = \{\infty\}$ so that $g_t^n \underset{(t,n)\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \infty$ in X but there is no $x \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $g_{t\,|(\hat{C}\setminus\{x\})}^n \underset{(t,n)\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} \infty$. Indeed, for any fixed $s \in [-1, 1]$ we have $g_{s\,|(\hat{\mathbb{C}}\setminus\{s\})}^n \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} \infty$ and $(g_s^n)_n$ is a subnet of $(g_t^n)_{(t,n)}$.

Let us make the following observation: for all $t, u \in T$, for all $h \in G$ and for all net $(g_n)_n$ on G, if $g_{n|(T\setminus\{u\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} t$ (hence $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$ in X) then $(g_n \cdot h)_{|(T\setminus\{h^{-1}\cdot u\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} t$ and $(h \cdot g_n)_{|(T\setminus\{u\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} h \cdot t$.

The following result is a generalization of this fact:

Theorem 20.

The actions $\left| \begin{array}{rccl} \hat{R}: & G \times X & \to & X \\ & (g, x) & \mapsto & \begin{cases} x \cdot g & \text{if } x \in G \\ x & \text{if } x \in T \end{cases} \end{array} \right.$ and $\left| \begin{array}{rccl} \hat{L}: & G \times X & \to & X \\ & (g, x) & \mapsto & g \cdot x \end{array} \right.$ are continuous.

Proof. As the multiplication of G is continuous and as G is open in X, we only need to show the continuity of these maps at a point $(g, t) \in G \times T$. Let then $(g_n)_n$ be a net on G and $(x_n)_n$ be a net on X such that $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} g$ in G and $x_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$ in X, we want to show that $\hat{R}(g_n, x_n) = x_n \cdot g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \hat{R}(g, t) = t$ and that $\hat{L}(g_n, x_n) = g_n \cdot x_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \hat{L}(g, t) = g \cdot t$ in X.

Using the partition $\{n \mid x_n \in T\} \sqcup \{n \mid x_n \in G\}$ of the indices and noting that $\hat{R}_{|(G\times T)}$ and $\hat{L}_{|(G\times T)}$ are continuous, it is enough to consider the case where $x_n \in G$ for all n. By Proposition 18 the net $(x_n)_n$ is wandering and satisfies $\mathcal{A}(x_n)_n = \{t\}$, we want to show that the net $(x_n \cdot g_n)_n$ (resp. the net $(g_n \cdot x_n)_n$) is wandering and has only one attractor point, namely t (resp. $g \cdot t$).

By contradiction, assume that there exists a subnet $(x_i \cdot g_i)_i$ (resp. $(g_i \cdot x_i)_i$) converging in G to a point $h \in G$. As G is a topological group and as $g_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} g$ in G, we have $g_i^{-1} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} g^{-1}$ in G and

$x_i = (x_i \cdot g_i) \cdot g_i^{-1} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} h \cdot g^{-1}$ in G hence in X (resp. $x_i = g_i^{-1} \cdot (g_i \cdot x_i) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} g^{-1} \cdot h$), which is in contradiction with $x_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t \in T$. We deduce that the nets $(x_n \cdot g_n)_n$ and $(g_n \cdot x_n)_n$ are also wandering.

Let then $u, v \in T$ and $(x_i \cdot g_i)_{i\in I}$ be a subnet such that $(x_i \cdot g_i)_{|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$, we want to show that $x_{i|(T\smallsetminus\{g\cdot v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$ so that necessarily $u = t$. Let then K be a compact subset of $T \smallsetminus \{g \cdot v\}$ and V be a neighborhood of u in T.

We first claim that there exists a neighborhood $W_0 \in \mathcal{N}_T(v)$ such that $g_i^{-1} \cdot K \subseteq T \smallsetminus W_0$ for i large enough. Assume that this is not true: for all $W \in \mathcal{N}_T(v)$ and all $i \in I$, there exists then $j = j(i, W) \geqslant i$ and $k_j \in K$ such that $g_j^{-1} \cdot k_j \in W$. The set $I \times \mathcal{N}_T(v)$ is directed so that $(g_j^{-1} \cdot k_j)_{(i,W)}$ is a net on T, converging to v by construction. As $(k_j)_{(i,W)}$ is a net on K which is compact, some subnet $(k_{j'})_{j'}$ converges to a point $k \in K$ distinct from $g \cdot v$. But the action of G on T is continuous so that the net $(g_{j'}^{-1} \cdot k_{j'})_{j'}$ converges to $g^{-1} \cdot k \neq v$, a contradiction.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that W_0 is open so that $T \smallsetminus W_0$ is a compact subset of $T \smallsetminus \{v\}$. As $(x_i \cdot g_i)_{|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$, for i large enough we have $x_i \cdot K = (x_i \cdot g_i) \cdot (g_i^{-1} \cdot K) \subseteq (x_i \cdot g_i) \cdot (T \smallsetminus W_0) \subseteq V$. We got the stated result: $x_{i|(T\smallsetminus\{g\cdot v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$ and $u = t$, hence $\mathcal{A}(x_n \cdot g_n)_n = \{t\}$.

The arguments are the same for the net $(g_n \cdot x_n)_n$: let $u, v \in T$ and let $(g_i \cdot x_i)_i$ be a subnet such that $(g_i \cdot x_i)_{|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$. For every open neighborhood $V \in \mathcal{N}_T(g^{-1} \cdot u)$ (then $T \smallsetminus V$ is a compact subset of $T \smallsetminus \{g^{-1} \cdot u\}$) there exists a neighborhood $V' \in \mathcal{N}_T(u)$ such that $g_i \cdot (T \smallsetminus V) \subseteq (T \smallsetminus V')$ (i.e. $g_i^{-1} \cdot V' \subseteq V$) for i large enough. Then for every compact subset $K \subseteq T \smallsetminus \{v\}$ we have $x_i \cdot K = g_i^{-1} \cdot ((g_i \cdot x_i) \cdot K) \subseteq g_i^{-1} \cdot V' \subseteq V$ for i large enough, which means that $x_{i|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} g^{-1} \cdot u$ and $u = g \cdot t$, hence $\mathcal{A}(g_n \cdot x_n)_n = \{g \cdot t\}$. □

Proposition 18 and Theorem 20 together imply Theorem B:

Theorem 21. If G is a locally compact convergence group acting minimally on a compactum T then the attractor sum of G and T, endowed with the $\hat{L}$-action defined previously, is a quasi-Specker compactification of G (see the introduction or Definitions 25).

We will use the following corollary:

Corollary 22. If G acts minimally with convergence property on a totally disconnected compactum T then the attractor sum of G and T is a (complete) Specker compactification of G.

Note that by Lemma 16 any convergence action induces a minimal convergence action on a totally disconnected space, hence a Specker compactification.

We give now a short proof of [11, 8.3]:

Proposition 23. The action of G on the attractor sum X of G and T is convergence.

Proof. Let $(g_n)_n$ be a wandering net on G. Up to passing to a subnet we can assume that there exists $u, v \in T$ such that $g_{n|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$ (we have then $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} u$ in X, see Proposition 18). We show that $g_{n|(X\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$.

Arguing by contradiction, assume that this is not the case: as in the proof of Lemma 10, there exists a point $x \in X \smallsetminus \{v\}$, a point $y \in X \smallsetminus \{u\}$, a subnet $(g_i)_i$ and a net $(x_i)_i$ on G such that $x_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} x$ and $g_i \cdot x_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} y$.

First note that if $x \in G$ then for i large enough $x_i \in G$ and as the map $\hat{R}$ is continuous we get that $g_i \cdot x_i = \hat{R}(x_i, g_i) \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} u \neq y$ in X, a contradiction. We deduce that $x \in T$, and as $g_i^{-1} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} v$ in X the same argument applied to $x_i = g_i^{-1} \cdot (g_i \cdot x_i)$ gives also that $y \in T$.

Up to passing to a subnet, we can assume either that $x_i \in T$ for all i or that $x_i \in G$ for all i. In the first case, let K be a compact neighborhood of x not containing v, as $x_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} x \neq v$ in T we have $x_i \in K$ for i large enough and the property $g_{i|(T\smallsetminus\{v\})} \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} u$ implies that $g_i \cdot x_i \underset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} v$, a contradiction.

In the second case, up to passing again to a subnet we can assume that there exists $\lambda, \mu \in T$ such that $x_{i|(T\smallsetminus\{\lambda\})} \xrightarrow[i\to\infty]{} x$ and $g_i \cdot x_{i|(T\smallsetminus\{\mu\})} \xrightarrow[i\to\infty]{} y$, but then if we pick a point $p \in T \smallsetminus \{\lambda, \mu\}$ on one hand we have $(g_i \cdot x_i) \cdot p \xrightarrow[i\to\infty]{} y$ because $p \neq \mu$ and on a other hand we have $x_i \cdot p \xrightarrow[i\to\infty]{} x \neq v$ so that $g_i \cdot (x_i \cdot p) \xrightarrow[i\to\infty]{} u$, once more a contradiction. □

We will need the following result in section 7, it has already been proved in the case of a discrete group [12, Lemma 5.3].

Lemma 24. Let G act with convergence property on two compacta M and N and let $f : M \to N$ be a continuous G-equivariant map. If the action of G on N is non-elementary then the map $\tilde{f} : G \sqcup M \to G \sqcup N$ extending f on the attractor sums by the identity on G is G-equivariant and continuous.

Proof. Note that if G acts with convergence property on M and if there exists $m \in M$ such that $|G/\mathrm{Stab}(m)| \leqslant 2$ then the action is elementary.

Under the hypotheses of the lemma we first show the following: if $m_a, m_r \in M$, if $n_a, n_r \in N$ and if $(g_n)_n$ is a wandering net on G such that $g_{n|(M\smallsetminus\{m_r\})} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} m_a$ and $g_{n|(N\smallsetminus\{n_r\})} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} n_a$ then $n_a = f(m_a)$ and $n_r = f(m_r)$.

Let $m \in M \smallsetminus \{m_r\}$, we have $g_n \cdot m \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} m_a$ in M. If $f(m) \neq n_r$ then $f(g_n \cdot m) = g_n \cdot f(m)$ converges both to $f(m_a)$ and n_a in N so that $n_a = f(m_a)$. Assume then that $f(m) = n_r$. As the action of G on N is non elementary by the previous remark $|G/\mathrm{Stab}(n_r)| \geqslant 3$ and there exists $g_1, g_2 \in G$ such that $|\{n_r, g_1 \cdot n_r, g_2 \cdot n_r\}| = 3$. As $g_i \cdot n_r = f(g_i \cdot m)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $g_1 \cdot m \neq g_2 \cdot m$ and we can pick $m' \in \{g_1 \cdot m, g_2 \cdot m\}$ satisfying $m' \neq m_r$ and $f(m') \neq n_r$. Changing m to m' in the previous arguments leads again to $n_a = f(m_a)$.

As $g_n^{-1}{}_{|(M\smallsetminus\{m_a\})} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} m_r$ and $g_n^{-1}{}_{|(N\smallsetminus\{n_a\})} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} n_r$ the same proof gives $n_r = f(m_r)$.

We can now prove the lemma. Easily, $\tilde{f}$ is continuous on the open subsets G and Ω_M of M. Let $(x_n)_n$ be a net on $G \sqcup M$ converging to a point $\lambda \in \Lambda_M$, we show that $\tilde{f}(x_n) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \tilde{f}(\lambda) = f(\lambda)$. As in the proof of Theorem 20 it is enough to consider the case when $x_n \in G$ for all n. By Proposition 18 the net $(x_n)_n$ is wandering and satisfies $\mathcal{A}_M(x_n)_n = \{\lambda\}$, we want to show that $\mathcal{A}_N(x_n)_n = \{f(\lambda)\}$. If $n_a, n_r \in N$ and if $(x_i)_i$ is a subnet satisfying $x_{i|(N\smallsetminus\{n_r\})} \xrightarrow[i\to\infty]{} n_a$, up to passing to a subnet we can assume that there exists $m_a, m_r \in M$ such that $x_{i|(M\smallsetminus\{m_r\})} \xrightarrow[i\to\infty]{} m_a$, necessarily $m_a = \lambda$ and the previous result gives then $n_a = f(\lambda)$. □

6 Specker Compactifications

The aim of this section is to recall Abels' classification of the Specker compactifications of a given group [2, Satz 1.6 and 1.8] (our Proposition 27), this yields the definition and a characterization of the space of ends.

Our methods in section 6 are inspired by those used by Abels to prove the classification. In order the paper to be self-contained we provide some details .

In the whole section we fix a locally compact Hausdorff topological group G.

Definitions 25. A topological space X is a **Specker compactification** of G if it satisfies the following properties:

1. X is a compactum,
2. G is homeomorphic to a dense open subset of X (we will identify G and this subset),
3. the "boundary" $\Lambda = X \smallsetminus G$ is totally disconnected (its only connected subsets are the singletons),

4. the map $\left|\begin{array}{rccl}\hat{R}: & G\times X & \to & X \\ & (g,x) & \mapsto & \begin{cases} x\cdot g & \text{if } x\in G \\ x & \text{if } x\in X\smallsetminus G\end{cases}\end{array}\right.$ is continuous,

5. there exists a continuous action (still denoted with $\cdot$) of G on $X\smallsetminus G$ such that the map $\left|\begin{array}{rccl}\hat{L}: & G\times X & \to & X \\ & (g,x) & \mapsto & g\cdot x\end{array}\right.$ is continuous.

A topological space X satisfying the three first points (related only to the topological structure of G) is a **zero-dimensional compactification** of G. A topological space X satisfying all points but the third is a **quasi-Specker compactification** of G.

Two compactifications X and Y of G are **equivalent** if the identity map $G\to G$ extends to a homeomorphism $X\to Y$.

We make a few observations. In the second point, assuming that G is open in X is in fact redundant (see for instance [3]).

In Abels' definition of a Specker compactification (first definition in [2]), the fifth point is less restrictive, it is only needed that for all g in G the left multiplication $L_g: G\to G, h\mapsto g\cdot h$ extends to a continuous map $\hat{L}_g: X\to X$. In the case we are interested in the difference is not pertinent: we directly get the continuity of $\hat{L}$ in Theorem 20 and in section 7 we would need to rewrite [2, Lemma 3.1] which is only technical.

Notations 26.

- For all $A,B\subseteq G$, let $A+B=(A\smallsetminus B)\cup(B\smallsetminus A)$ be the symmetric difference of A and B.
- If A is a subset of a topological space X, we write $\partial_X A$ be the boundary of A in X, i.e. the set $\partial_X A=\bar{A}\smallsetminus\mathring{A}$ of all limit points of A that are not interior to A (for the topology of X).
- Let $\mathcal{B}$ (resp. $\mathcal{K}$) be the family of all bounded (resp. compact) subsets of G.
- Let $\mathcal{U}^+=\{A\subseteq G\mid \partial_G A\in\mathcal{B}\}$. Endowed with symmetric difference and intersection $\mathcal{U}^+$ is a Boolean algebra (with identity elements $0=\varnothing$ for $+$ and $1=G$ for $\cap$) in which $\mathcal{B}$ is an ideal.
- Let $\mathcal{U}^G=\{A\in\mathcal{U}^+\mid \forall K\in\mathcal{K}\smallsetminus\{\varnothing\},\ (A\cdot K)+A\in\mathcal{B}\}$, this is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{U}^+$ containing $\mathcal{B}$ and a G-module for the left action of G.

Proposition 27. The map $X\mapsto\mathcal{U}(X)=\{B\cap G\mid B\subseteq X \text{ and } \partial_X B\subseteq M\}$ induces a bijection between equivalence classes of zero-dimensional compactifications of G and subalgebras of $\mathcal{U}^+$ containing $\mathcal{B}$. In this correspondance the (equivalence classes of) Specker compactifications of G correspond exactly to the subalgebras of $\mathcal{U}^G$ containing $\mathcal{B}$ which are also G-submodules of $\mathcal{U}^G$.

Sketch of the proposition's proof. Let us first fix a zero-dimensional compactification X of G and let $\Lambda=X\smallsetminus M$. Note that Λ is closed in X hence compact, and as it is totally disconnected by definition, it has a base of closed and open subsets (see for instance [7]). The key fact to get the classifications is the following lemma:

Lemma 28. For all $x\in X$, the family $\mathcal{W}_x=\{B\subseteq X\mid x\in B \text{ and } \partial_X B\subseteq G\}$ is a local basis at x.

Proof of the lemma. For all $x\in G$, the family of compact neighborhoods of x is a local basis at x and a subfamily of $\mathcal{W}_x$, it is then enough to consider the case when $x\in\Lambda$. For $B\in\mathcal{W}_x$ we have $x\in B\subseteq\bar{B}$ and as $\partial_X B\subseteq G$ and $x\notin G$, $x\in\mathring{B}$, which means that $B\in\mathcal{N}_X(x)$. Conversely, let $V\in\mathcal{N}_X(x)$, we can assume that V is open. By the previous remark, there exists a closed and open subset O of Λ such that $x\in O\subseteq V\cap\Lambda$, hence there exists an open subset V' of X such that $O=V'\cap\Lambda$. Then O is closed in X and disjoint from $X\smallsetminus V'$, and as X is a compactum, there exists disjoint open subsets

U and W of X containing O and $X \setminus V'$ respectively. Let us change U to $U \cap V$, we get then $U \subseteq V$. For $r \in \Lambda$, either $r \in O \subseteq U = \mathring{U}$ or $r \notin O$ then $r \in X \setminus V' \subseteq W$, but $U \subseteq X \setminus W$ which is closed so $\bar{U} \subseteq X \setminus W$ and $r \notin \bar{U}$. Finally $\partial_X U \cap \Lambda = \varnothing$ and $x \in U$, which means that $U \in \mathcal{W}_x$. □

Let $\mathcal{U}(X)$ be as in the statement of the proposition, we easily check that it is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{U}^+$ containing $\mathcal{B}$. With the lemma, we can show that for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, the subfamily $\mathcal{F}_\lambda = \{B \cap G \mid B \in \mathcal{W}_\lambda\}$ of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ satisfies the following properties: it is non-empty, it does not contain any bounded subset, it is stable by finite intersection and by "growth" (i.e. $\forall A \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda, \forall B \in \mathcal{U}(X), A \cup B \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda$), and it is such that for all $A \in \mathcal{U}(X)$, one exactly of A and $G \setminus A$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$. In other words, $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ is an **ultrafilter** in $\mathcal{U}(X)$.

We deduce then that the family $\mathcal{P}_\lambda = \mathcal{U}(X) \setminus \mathcal{F}_\lambda$ coincides with the set $\{G \setminus A \mid A \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda\}$ and satisfies the following properties:

- $G \notin \mathcal{P}_\lambda$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda$,
- $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda,\ A + B \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda$,
- $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda, \forall B \in \mathcal{U}(X),\ A \cap B \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda$,
- $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{U}(X),\ A \cap B \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda \Rightarrow (A \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda \text{ or } B \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda)$.

In others words, $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$ is a prime ideal of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ containing $\mathcal{B}$. Moreover, we can show that the map $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{P}_\lambda$ is a bijection between Λ and the set of prime ideals of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ containing $\mathcal{B}$. We have then characterized points of Λ only in terms of the subalgebra $\mathcal{U}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{U}^+$. In this characterization, for any subset $A \in \mathcal{U}(X)$ and any point $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have $\bar{A} \in \mathcal{N}_X(\lambda)$ if and only if $A \notin \mathcal{P}_\lambda$.

Let now $\mathcal{U}$ be any subalgebra of $\mathcal{U}^+$. Following the previous results, let $\Lambda(\mathcal{U})$ be the set of prime ideals of $\mathcal{U}$ and let $X(\mathcal{U}) = G \sqcup \Lambda(\mathcal{U})$. We say that a subset $B \subseteq X(\mathcal{U})$ is open in $X(\mathcal{U})$ if $B \cap G$ is open in G and if for all $\lambda \in B \cap \Lambda(\mathcal{U})$, there exists $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $A \subseteq B$ and $\lambda \in \{\mu \in \Lambda \mid A \notin \mu\} \subseteq B$. This defines a topology on $X(\mathcal{U})$ satisfying all properties of a zero-dimensional compactification of G.

We check finally that $\mathcal{U}(X(\mathcal{U})) = \mathcal{U}$ and that $X(\mathcal{U}(X))$ and X are equivalent for any zero-dimensional compactification X of G. This gives the first part of the proposition.

We give the proof of the second part because some details are missing in [2].

Let us first fix a Specker compactification X of G, we set again $\Lambda = X \setminus G$. In the following, the closure and the interior are taken relatively to the topology of X. We write $\hat{L}_g$ the map $X \to X, x \mapsto g \cdot x$ for any $g \in G$.

If $A = B \cap G$ where $B \subseteq X$ satisfies $\partial_X B \subseteq G$ and if $g \in G$, we have $g \cdot A = \hat{L}_g(B) \cap G$ and $\hat{L}_g$ is a homeomorphism so that $\partial_X(\hat{L}_g(B)) = \hat{L}_g(\partial_X B) \subseteq G$. We deduce that $\mathcal{U}(X)$ is a G-module for the left action.

Let B be a subset of X such that $\partial_X B \subseteq G$ and let $K \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, we want to show that $A = B \cap G$ satisfies $A \cdot K + A \in \mathcal{B}$. Let us say that a subset $P \subseteq X$ satisfies property $\mathcal{P}_B$ if P is a neighborhood of $B \cap \Lambda$ in X and if $P \cap \Lambda = B \cap \Lambda$. By assumption B, $\mathring{B}$ and $\bar{B}$ satisfy property $\mathcal{P}_B$. For $k \in K$, $\hat{R}_k : x \to \hat{R}(k, x)$ is a homeomorphism of X which coincides with Id_Λ on Λ so that $\hat{R}_k(\bar{B})$ also satisfy property $\mathcal{P}_B$. As K is compact it is closed, as X is compact so is $\bar{B}$ and we have $\hat{R}(K \times B) = \hat{R}(K \times \bar{B}) = \bigcup_{k \in K} \hat{R}_k(\bar{B})$, this is a closed subset of X satisfiying property $\mathcal{P}_B$. We deduce that $\hat{R}(K \times \bar{B}) \setminus \mathring{B}$ is closed in X and contained in G so that it is a compact subset of G, moreover we can check that it coincides with $\bar{A} \cdot K \setminus \mathring{A}$. Similar arguments show that $\bar{B} \setminus \hat{R}(K \times \mathring{B}) = \bar{A} \setminus \mathring{A} \cdot K$ is a compact subset of G. We deduce that $A \cdot K + A = (A \cdot K \setminus A) \cup (A \setminus A \cdot K) \subseteq (\bar{A} \cdot K \setminus \mathring{A}) \cup (\bar{A} \setminus \mathring{A} \cdot K)$ so that it is bounded. We conclude that $\mathcal{U}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{U}^G$.

Conversely, let $\mathcal{U}$ be a subalgebra and a G-submodule of $\mathcal{U}^G$ containing $\mathcal{B}$. Let X be the corresponding zero-dimensional compactification of G (first part of the proposition) and let $\Lambda = X \setminus G$.

For all $g \in G$, the definition of the topology on X gives that the map $\hat{L}_g$ such that $L_g(h) = g \cdot h$ for $h \in G$ and $\hat{L}_g(p) = \{L_g(A) \mid A \in p\}$ for $p \in \Lambda$ is continuous. Let us then show that the map $\hat{R} : G \times Y \mapsto Y$ extending the right multiplication of G and coinciding with the second projection on $G \times \Lambda$ is continuous. It is enough to show the continuity at a point $(g, p) \in G \times \Lambda$. Let $U \in \mathcal{N}_X(p)$ and $W \in \mathcal{N}_G(g)$, without loss of generality we can assume that W is compact and that U is of the form $A^+ = A \sqcup \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid A \notin \lambda\}$ for an open subset $A \subseteq G$ belonging to $\mathcal{U}$. Let $K = A \cdot W + A$, then $K \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\bar{K} \cdot W^{-1}$ is a compact (hence closed) subset of G. Then $B = A \cap (\bar{K} \cdot W^{-1})^*$ is open and satisfies $B + A \in \mathcal{B}$, hence $B \in \mathcal{U}$ and $A^+ \cap G = B^+ \cap G$ (where B^+ denotes the similar "extension" of B), so that B^+ is a neighborhood of p in X. We have $\hat{R}(W, B^+) \cap R = A^+ \cap R$ and for all $w \in W$ and all $b \in B$, as $b \in A$ we have $b \cdot w \in A \cdot W$ and $b \cdot w \notin K = A \cdot W + A$ (if not $b \in \bar{K} \cdot W^{-1}$), hence $b \cdot w \in A$. We deduce that $\hat{R}(W, B^+) \subseteq A^+$ and the continuity of $\hat{R}$.

In conclusion X is a Specker compactification, we have the proposition. □

Remarks 29.

- Let $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ be two subalgebras of $\mathcal{U}^G$ containing $\mathcal{B}$ which are also G-submodules and such that $\mathcal{U}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_2$. For any prime ideal p of $\mathcal{U}_2$ we see that $p \cap U_1$ is a prime ideal of $\mathcal{U}_1$, and by construction the map $f : X(\mathcal{U}_2) \to X(\mathcal{U}_1)$ extending the identity on G and such that $f(p) = p \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ for all $p \in \Lambda(\mathcal{U}_2)$ is surjective, G-equivariant and continuous.

- The Specker compactification X_E corresponding to $\mathcal{U}^G$ is universal in the following sense: for every Specker compactification $\hat{G}$ of G, there exists a (unique) surjective G-equivariant continuous map $X_E \to \hat{G}$ extending the identity on G.

The space X_E is the **end compactification** in the sense of E. Specker [15], the space $E = X_E \setminus G$ is the **space of ends** of G, it is a totally disconnected compactum on which G acts with the $\hat{L}$-action.

7 Case of a compactly generated group

We want now to prove Theorem C, from which we will deduce Theorem D. The tools that we use are adapted from [1] and [2, §2 and §3], we try to keep the same notations.

We start with the construction of the Cayley-Abels graph of a compactly generated group G, we fix then a Specker compactification X and show the convergence property for the action of G on X (Theorem 34), this yields Theorem C. We conclude with the proof of Theorem D and some considerations about the hypotheses in Theorem C.

In the whole section, G is a **compactly generated** locally compact topological group, we write multiplicatively (with $\cdot$) the group operation.

Lemma 30. There exists a compact symmetric neighborhood $F \in \mathcal{N}_G(1)$ that generates G.

Proof. If K is a compact subset generating G (i.e. $G = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K^n$) by Baire's lemma some K^n has a non-empty interior, we then check that $F = (K \cup K^{-1})^{2n}$ is as in the statement of the lemma. □

Definitions 31. The **Cayley-Abels graph** of G (relatively to the generating set F) is the set (of edges) $\Gamma = \{(x, x \cdot f) \mid x \in G, f \in F\}$. A **$\Gamma$-path** connecting two points $g, h \in G$ is a finite sequence $g = x_0,\ x_1,\ \ldots\ ,\ x_n = h$ (where $n \in \mathbb{N}$) of points in G such that $(x_0, x_1), \ldots,\ (x_{n-1}, x_n) \in \Gamma$, we say that the path is **in** a subset $A \subseteq G$ if all the x_i belongs to A. Let A be a subset of G. We say that A is **Γ-connected** if any two points in A can be connected by a Γ-path in A. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A^{\leqslant n} = A \cdot F^n$ be the set of points of G whose "Γ-distance" from A is at most n and let $\partial_\Gamma A = A^{\leqslant 1} \cap (G \setminus A)^{\leqslant 1}$ be the **Γ-boundary** of A.

Recall that $\mathcal{U}^G$ is the set of all "compactly almost invariant" subsets of G and that $\mathcal{B}$ is the family of bounded subsets of G (see Notations 26).

Proposition 32.

- G is Γ-connected.
- Any bounded subset of G is contained in a compact Γ-connected subset.
- The family $\mathcal{U}_\Gamma = \{A \subseteq G \mid \partial_\Gamma A \in \mathcal{B}\}$ coincides with $\mathcal{U}^G$.

In [2] the third point is stated but it is proved only in the case where G is discrete.

Proof. Let $g, h \in G$. As F generates G, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_1, \dots, f_n \in F$ such that $g^{-1} \cdot h = f_1 \dots f_n$. This means that $1,\ f_1,\ f_1 \cdot f_2,\ \dots\ ,\ f_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot f_n = g^{-1} \cdot h$ is a Γ-path connecting 1 to $g^{-1} \cdot h$, so that the "translated" path $g = g \cdot 1,\ g \cdot f_1,\ \dots\ ,\ g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot h) = h$ is a Γ-path connecting g to h. We have the first point.

Recall that F is a compact symmetric neighborhood of $1 \in G$. If K is a fixed compact Γ-connected subset of G (for instance a singleton), we easily check that $(K^{\leqslant n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence of compact Γ-connected subsets of G whose interiors cover G, so that any bounded subset of G is contained in some $K^{\leqslant n}$. We deduce the second point.

Let us show that $U^G = U_\Gamma$. If $A \in \mathcal{U}^G$, we check that $\partial_\Gamma A \subseteq (A + A \cdot F) \cdot F \in \mathcal{B}$ (recall that $+$ stands for the symmetric difference) hence $A \in \mathcal{U}_\Gamma$. Conversely, let $A \in \mathcal{U}_\Gamma$. We first check that $A + A \cdot F \subseteq \partial_\Gamma A = \bigcup_{f \in F}(A + A \cdot f)$ hence $A + A \cdot F \in \mathcal{B}$ and $A + A \cdot f \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $f \in F$. Using the fact that F generates G, we get that $A + A \cdot g \in \mathcal{B}$ and $A + A \cdot F \cdot g \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $g \in G$. If W is a non-empty compact subset of G, there exists a finite subset $V \subseteq W$ such that $W \subseteq \bigcup_{v \in V} F \cdot v$, and we can show that for any $w \in W$ we have $A + A \cdot W \subseteq \bigcup_{v \in V}(A + A \cdot F \cdot v) \cup (A + A \cdot w) \in \mathcal{B}$. As $A \cdot F$ (resp. $(G \smallsetminus A) \cdot F$) is a neighborhood of A (resp. of $G \smallsetminus A$) in G, we get $\partial_G A \subseteq \partial_\Gamma A$ so that $\partial_G A \in \mathcal{B}$. We conclude that $A \in \mathcal{U}^G$. □

Until the end of the section, we fix a Specker compactification X of G (Definitions 25). Again, Λ denotes the "Specker boundary" $\Lambda = X \smallsetminus G$.

In this context of a compactly generated group, the fifth point of Definitions 25 could be "relaxed", see [2, Lemma 3.1] and the notes below Definitions 25.

Recall that Proposition 27 gives $\mathcal{U}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{U}^G$, we just showed that $\mathcal{U}_\Gamma = \mathcal{U}^G$. We deduce that for any subset $B \subseteq X$, if $\partial_X B \subseteq G$ then $\partial_\Gamma(B \cap G) \in \mathcal{B}$.

We need the following lemma (generalizing Lemma 28) to prove the convergence property. It is adapted from [1, 3.5 and 4.4] and [2, 3.4].

Lemma 33. Let $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

- The family $B_\lambda = \{V \in \mathcal{N}_X(\lambda) \mid \partial_\Gamma(V \cap G) \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } G \smallsetminus V \text{ is } \Gamma\text{-connected}\}$ is a local basis at λ.
- If $V \in B_\lambda$ and if $B \subseteq X$ satisfies $\partial_\Gamma(B \cap G) \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists a neighborhood W of λ in X such that for all $g \in W \cap G$, either $g \cdot B \subseteq V$ or $g \cdot B \supseteq X \smallsetminus V$.

Proof. In the proof, we will use the following notations: V and V' will be subsets of X, U and U' will be their traces of G, i.e. $U = V \cap G$ and $U' = V' \cap G$, and Q and Q' will be their complement in G, i.e. $Q = G \smallsetminus V = G \smallsetminus U$ and $Q' = G \smallsetminus V' = G \smallsetminus U'$.

Let $V' \in \mathcal{N}_X(\lambda)$, by Lemma 28 we can assume that $\partial_X V' \subseteq G$ so that $\partial_\Gamma U' \in \mathcal{B}$ (see remark above). There exists a compact Γ-connected subset $K \subseteq G$ containing $\partial_\Gamma U'$ by Proposition 32, we say that $V = V' \smallsetminus K$ is contained in V' and belongs to B_λ.

As K is a compact subset of G we already have $V \in \mathcal{N}_X(\lambda)$. For all $A, B \subseteq G$ we check that $(A \cap B) \cdot F \subseteq A \cdot F \cup B \cdot F$ so that $\partial_\Gamma(A \cap B) \subseteq \partial_\Gamma A \cup \partial_\Gamma B$. Noting then that $\partial_\Gamma(G \smallsetminus K) = \partial_\Gamma K \subseteq K^{\leqslant 1} \in \mathcal{B}$ and that $U = U' \cap (G \smallsetminus K)$, we get that $\partial_\Gamma U$ is bounded.

In order to show that $Q = G \setminus U$ is Γ-connected, we show that every Γ-path connecting points of Q and "going out Q" can be "diverted" so that it stays in Q. Let then $a, b \in Q$, $u, v \in U = G \setminus Q$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g_1, \dots, g_n \in G$ be such that $(a,u), (u,g_1), \dots, (g_n, v), (v,b) \in \Gamma$, we want to show that $a, b \in K$. Note that $Q = Q' \cup K$ and that if $a \in Q'$, as $(a,u) \in \Gamma$ and as $Q' = G \setminus U' \subseteq (G \setminus U') \cdot F$ there exists $f \in F$ such that $u = a \cdot f$ hence $a = u \cdot f^{-1} \in U \cdot F \subseteq U' \cdot F$ and finally $a \in \partial_\Gamma U' \subseteq K$. In all cases we have $a \in K$ and the same holds for b. As K is Γ-connected there exists a Γ-path connecting a to b in K hence in Q.

Let now a, b be any points in Q. By Γ-connectedness of G there exists a Γ-path connecting a to b and we can "divert all Γ-subpaths going out Q" as earlier (there are only finitely many of them) so that the resulting path is a Γ-path in Q. We deduce that Q is Γ-connected and the first point.

Let $V \in B_\lambda$ and let $B \subseteq X$ be such that $\partial_\Gamma A$ is bounded, where $A = B \cap G$. Recall that $\hat{R}$ is continuous on $G \times X$ and that $\hat{R}(G \times \{\lambda\}) = \{\lambda\}$. For $g \in \overline{\partial_\Gamma A}$ there exists then $O_g \in \mathcal{N}_G(g)$ and $W_g \in \mathcal{N}_X(\lambda)$ such that $\hat{R}(O_g \times W_g) \subseteq V$, and by compacity there exists a finite family $D \subseteq \overline{\partial_\Gamma A}$ such that $\overline{\partial_\Gamma A} \subseteq \bigcup_{g \in D} O_g$. Then $W = \bigcap_{g \in D} W_g$ is a neighborhood of λ in X such that for any $g \in W \cap G$ we have $\hat{R}(\partial_\Gamma A \times \{g\}) \subseteq V$ i.e. $g \cdot \partial_\Gamma A \subseteq V$.

Let us assume that there exists $g \in W \cap G$ and $a, b \in G \setminus V$ such that $\{g^{-1}(a), g^{-1}(b)\}$ intersects both A and $G \setminus A$. As $G \setminus V$ is Γ-connected, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a Γ-path $a = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = b$ in $G \setminus V$. The translated path $g^{-1} \cdot x_0, \dots, g^{-1} \cdot x_n$ connects a point in A and a point in $G \setminus A$, it follows from the definition of $\partial_\Gamma A$ that there exists i such that $g^{-1} \cdot x_i \in \partial_\Gamma A$, but then $x_i = g \cdot (g^{-1} \cdot x_i) \in G \setminus V \cap g \cdot \partial_\Gamma A = \varnothing$, a contradiction.

This means that for all $g \in W \setminus G$ there are two cases: either $g^{-1}(G \setminus V) \subseteq G \setminus A$, hence $G \setminus V \subseteq g \cdot (G \setminus A)$ and $g \cdot A \subseteq G \cap V \subseteq V$; or $g^{-1}(G \setminus V) \subseteq A$, hence $g \cdot A \supseteq G \setminus V$. In both these inclusions we can change A to B and G to X because $x \mapsto g \cdot x$ is an homeomorphism of X letting G and Λ invariant and because $P \cap \Lambda = \overline{P \cap G} \cap \Lambda$ for all $P \in \mathcal{U}_X(G)$, hence for $P \in \{B, V, X \setminus V\}$. We have the second point. □

We arrive to the main result of the section:

Theorem 34. If G is a locally compact and compactly generated topological group and if X is a Specker compactification of G then the action of G on X is convergence and its limit set is the "Specker boundary" $\Lambda = X \setminus G$.

Proof. Let $(g_n)_n$ be a wandering net on G. As X is compact, up to passing to a subnet we can assume that there exists points $\lambda, \mu \in X$ such that $g_n \underset{n \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda$ and $g_n^{-1} \underset{n \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} \mu$ in X. The net $(g_n)_n$ is wandering on G which is open in X and $g \mapsto g^{-1}$ is continuous on G, we then have necessarily $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. We claim that $g_{n|(X \setminus \{\mu\})} \underset{n \to \infty}{\twoheadrightarrow} \lambda$, we deduce the convergence property.

Reasoning by contradiction, assume that it is not the case: there exists a compact set $K \subseteq X \setminus \{\mu\}$, a neighborhood $V \in \mathcal{N}_X(\lambda)$ and a subnet $(g_i)_i$ such that $g_i \cdot K \not\subseteq V$ for all i. We can assume that $\partial_\Gamma(V \cap G)$ is bounded and that $G \setminus V$ is Γ-connected by Lemma 33. There exists then a net $(x_i)_i$ in K such that $g_i \cdot x_i \notin V$ for all i, and up to passing to a subnet we can assume that $(x_i)_i$ converges to a point $x \in K$.

Let us fix $h \in G \setminus V$. We show that $g_i^{-1} \cdot h = \hat{R}(h, g_i^{-1}) \underset{i \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} x \in X$, which is in contradiction with $g_i^{-1} \underset{i \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} \mu$ in X and the continuity of $\hat{R}$ on $G \times X$ (note that $x \neq \mu$).

Let $V_x \in \mathcal{N}_X(x)$, we can again assume that $\partial_\Gamma(V_x \cap G) \in \mathcal{B}$. Now, if $W \in \mathcal{N}_X(\lambda)$ is as in the second point of the lemma applied to $B = V_x$, for i large enough $g_i \in W \cap G$ and $x_i \in V_x$ but $g_i \cdot x_i \notin V$ hence $g_i \cdot V_x \supseteq X \setminus V$, so that $h \in g_i \cdot V_x$ and $g_i^{-1} \cdot h \in V_x$ for i large enough. This means that $g_i^{-1} \cdot h \underset{i \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} x$.

The statement concerning the limit set is not hard. Any $g \in G$ has a compact neighborhood K in G hence in X and the set $\{h \in G \mid h \cdot K \cap K \neq \varnothing\}$ is exactly $K \cdot K^{-1}$ which is compact, so that the ordinary set contains G. Conversely, as G is dense in X for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there exists a net $(g_n)_n$

in G such that $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda$, up to passing to a subnet we can assume that there exists $\mu \in X$ such that $g_n^{-1} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \mu$, and as above we have $\mu \in \Lambda$ and $g_{n|(X\smallsetminus\{\mu\})} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow} \lambda$. We deduce that the limit set contains Λ and the stated result. □

We deduce Theorem C from Theorem 34 and Proposition 15:

Corollary 35. If G is a locally compact and compactly generated topological group and if X is a Specker compactification of G then the action of G on $X \smallsetminus G$ is convergence and minimal.

Let us now prove Theorem D. We first show a lemma establishing the existence of a "minimal Specker pullback":

Lemma 36. Let X and Y be two quasi-Specker compactifications of G. Let $\mathcal{S}(X,Y)$ be the closure in $X\times Y$ of the diagonal $\Delta(G) = \{(g,g) \mid g \in G\}$, we write $\pi_1 : X\times Y \to X$ (resp. $\pi_2 : X\times Y \to Y$) the canonical projection. We have the following:

- The space $\mathcal{S}(X,Y)$ is a quasi-Specker compactification of G (for the natural $\hat{L}$ action).
- For every quasi-Specker compactification Z of G endowed with two G-equivariant continuous maps $\pi_X : Z \to X$ and $\pi_Y : Z \to Y$ extending the identity on G there exists a unique surjective G-equivariant continuous map $\phi : Z \to \mathcal{S}(X,Y)$ extending the identity on G and such that $\pi_1 \circ \phi = \pi_X$ and $\pi_2 \circ \phi = \pi_Y$.
- When X and Y are "complete" Specker compactifications of G, so is $\mathcal{S}(X,Y)$.

Proof. Note that $\Delta(G)$ is naturally homeomorphic to G, we identify then $g \in G$ and $(g,g) \in \Delta(G)$.

By construction $\mathcal{S}(X,Y)$ is a compactum and contains G as a dense subset, we have the points 1 and 2 in Definitions 25.

Let us write $\hat{R}_X$ and $\hat{L}_X$ (resp. $\hat{R}_Y$ and $\hat{L}_Y$) the extensions to $G\times X$ (resp. to $G\times Y$) of the right and left translations of G. By definition of the product topology, the maps

$$\left|\begin{array}{rccl} \hat{R}: & G\times(X\times Y) & \to & X\times Y \\ & (g,(x,y)) & \mapsto & (\hat{R}_X(g,x), \hat{R}_Y(g,y)) \end{array}\right. \text{ and } \left|\begin{array}{rccl} \hat{L}: & G\times(X\times Y) & \to & X\times Y \\ & (g,(x,y)) & \mapsto & (\hat{L}_X(g,x), \hat{L}_Y(g,y)) \end{array}\right.$$

are continuous. We show that they let $\mathcal{S}(X,Y)$ invariant.

Let $g \in G$ and $(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}(X,Y)$. There exists a net $(g_n,g_n)_n$ on $\Delta(G)$ converging to (x,y) in $X\times Y$, and as $g\cdot g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} g\cdot x$ in X and $g\cdot g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} g\cdot y$ in Y we have $(g\cdot g_n, g\cdot g_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} (g\cdot x, g\cdot y) = g\cdot(x,y)$ in $X\times Y$. We deduce that $g\cdot\mathcal{S}(X,Y) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(X,Y)$. The same holds for g^{-1} so that $g\cdot\mathcal{S}(X,Y) = \mathcal{S}(X,Y)$. We deduce that $\hat{L}(G\times\mathcal{S}(X,Y)) = \mathcal{S}(X,Y)$, the same arguments show that $\hat{R}(G\times\mathcal{S}(X,Y)) = \mathcal{S}(X,Y)$.

We have the points 4 and 5 of Definitions 25: $\mathcal{S}(X,Y)$ is a quasi-Specker compactification of G.

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{S}(X,Y) \smallsetminus G \subseteq (X\smallsetminus G)\times(Y\smallsetminus G)$. As the connected components of a product are the product of the components and as the components of a subspace are contained in the components of the space, we deduce the last point of the lemma.

Let Z be a quasi-Specker compactification of G endowed with G-equivariant continuous maps $\pi_X : Z \to X$ and $\pi_Y : Z \to Y$ extending the identity on G. The map $\left|\begin{array}{rccl} \phi: & Z & \to & \mathcal{S}(X,Y) \\ & t & \mapsto & (\pi_X(t), \pi_Y(t)) \end{array}\right.$ is the only map $Z \to \mathcal{S}(X,Y)$ satisfying $\pi_X = \pi_1\circ\phi$ and $\pi_Y = \pi_2\circ\phi$. By construction the map ϕ is continuous, G-equivariant and extend the identity on G, we show that it is also surjective.

Let $(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}(X,Y)$, there exists a net $(g_n)_n$ on G converging to x in X and to y in Y. As Z is compact, up to passing to a subnet we can assume that there exists $z \in Z$ such that $g_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} z$ in Z. The net $(\pi_X(g_n))_n = (g_n)_n$ converges in X both to x and to $\pi_X(z)$ so that $x = \pi_X(z)$. We also have $y = \pi_Y(z)$ so that $\phi(z) = (x,y)$. We have the surjectivity. □

Recall that a **pullback** of two minimal convergence actions of G on compacta M and N is a triple (P, π_M, π_N) where P is a compactum on which G acts minimally with convergence property and $\pi_M : P \to M$ (resp. $\pi_N : P \to N$) is a G-equivariant continuous map. The pullback (P, π_M, π_N) is **minimal** if for any other pullback (T, p_M, p_N) there exists a G-equivariant continuous map $\phi : T \to P$ such that $\pi_M \circ \phi = p_M$ and $\pi_N \circ \phi = p_N$.

We can now prove Theorem D:

Theorem 37. Any two non-elementary minimal convergence actions of a locally compact and compactly generated group on totally disconnected compacta admit a minimal pullback.

Proof. Let G be a compactly generated group acting minimally with convergence property on two totally disconnected spaces M and N, we assume that the action are not elementary. We first construct a pullback and then show that it is minimal.

By Corollary 22 the attractor sums $X = G \sqcup M$ and $Y = G \sqcup N$ are Specker compactifications of G. We consider the Specker compactification $\mathcal{S}(X, Y)$ of G and the projections $\pi_1 : \mathcal{S}(X, Y) \to X$ and $\pi_2 : \mathcal{S}(X, Y) \to Y$ given by Lemma 36. We set $P = \mathcal{S}(X, Y) \setminus G$ and $\pi_M = (\pi_1)_{|P}$ (resp. $\pi_N = (\pi_2)_{|P}$), it is a G-equivariant continuous map $P \to M$ (resp. $P \to N$). By Corollary 35 the action of G on P is convergence and minimal so that (P, π_M, π_N) is a pullback of the actions of G on M and N.

Let now (T, p_M, p_N) be an other pullback of these actions. We first consider the space T' of connected components of T, the natural action of G on T' is convergence and minimal (see Lemma 16).

For every connected component C of T the image $p_M(C)$ is a connected subset of M (the map p_M is continuous) hence a singleton (M is totally disconnected). This shows that there exists a map $p'_M : T' \to M$ satisfying $p'_M \circ \pi = p_M$ (where $\pi : T \to T'$ is the canonical projection).

The construction of p'_M and the G-equivariance of p_M and π induce that p'_M also is G-equivariant. We show that p'_M is continuous by contradiction: assume that there exists a point $t' \in T'$ and a net $(t'_n)_n$ on T' such that $t'_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t'$ in T' and $p'_M(t'_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\not\longrightarrow} p'_M(t')$ in M. For all n there exists $t_n \in T$ such that $\pi(t_n) = t'_n$ and up to passing to a subnet we can assume that there exists $t \in T$ such that $t_n \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} t$. As π is continuous we have $t' = \pi(t)$ and as p_M is continuous and satisfies $p'_M \circ \pi = p_M$ we have $p'_M(t'_n) = p'_M(\pi(t_n)) = p_M(t_n) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} p_M(t) = p'_M(t')$, a contradiction.

Applying the same arguments with N instead of M there exists a G-equivariant continuous map $p'_N : T' \to N$ satisfying $p'_N \circ \pi = p_N$. It follows that (T', p'_M, p'_N) is a pullback of the actions of G on M and N.

Let us now consider the attractor sum $Z' = G \sqcup T'$ and p'_X (resp. p'_Y) the extension of p'_M (resp. of p'_N) on Z' by the identity of G. By Corollary 22 again Z' is a Specker compactification of G and by Lemma 24 the maps p'_X and p'_Y are continuous and G-equivariant. By the second point of Lemma 36 there exists then a surjective G-equivariant continuous map $\psi : Z' \to \mathcal{S}(X, Y)$ extending the identity on G and satisfying $\pi_1 \circ \psi = p'_X$ and $\pi_2 \circ \psi = p'_Y$.

We deduce that $\psi(T') = P$ so that the map $\phi = \psi \circ \pi : T \to P$ is G-equivariant and continuous. We have the corollary. □

We end our paper with considerations about the hypothesis in Theorem 34. In [12], the authors study the existence of pullbacks in a general context and show the following two facts:

- there exists two convergence actions of the discrete free group of rank 3 on two compacta (one of them not being totally disconnected) admitting no pullback space (Proposition 5.2),
- there exists two convergence actions of the discrete free group of countable rank on two totally disconnected compacta admitting no pullback space (Proposition 5.5).

This shows that both hypothesis "the Specker boundary is totally disconnected" and "the group is compactly generated" cannot be removed from the statement of Theorem 34.

References

[1] Herbert Abels. Enden von Räumen mit eigentlichen Transformationsgruppen. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 47:457–473, 1972.

[2] Herbert Abels. Specker-Kompaktifizierungen von lokal kompakten topologischen Gruppen. *Math. Z.*, 135:325–361, 1973/74.

[3] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Éléments de mathématique. Topologie générale. Chapitres 1 à 4*. Hermann, Paris, 1971.

[4] Brian H. Bowditch. A topological characterisation of hyperbolic groups. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 11(3):643–667, 1998.

[5] Brian H. Bowditch. Convergence groups and configuration spaces. In *Geometric group theory down under (Canberra, 1996)*, pages 23–54. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.

[6] Yves Cornulier. On the quasi-isometric classification of locally compact groups. 2015.

[7] Ryszard Engelking. *General topology*. PWN—Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, 1977. Translated from the Polish by the author, Monografie Matematyczne, Tom 60. [Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 60].

[8] Eric M. Freden. Properties of convergence groups and spaces. *Conform. Geom. Dyn.*, 1:13–23 (electronic), 1997.

[9] F. W. Gehring and G. J. Martin. Discrete quasiconformal groups. I. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 55(2):331–358, 1987.

[10] Victor Gerasimov. Expansive convergence groups are relatively hyperbolic. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(1):137–169, 2009.

[11] Victor Gerasimov. Floyd maps for relatively hyperbolic groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 22(5):1361–1399, 2012.

[12] Victor Gerasimov and Leonid Potyagailo. Similar relatively hyperbolic actions of a group. *Int. Math. Res. Not. (IMRN)*, 2015.

[13] John L. Kelley. *General topology*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1975. Reprint of the 1955 edition [Van Nostrand, Toronto, Ont.], Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 27.

[14] R. S. Kulkarni. Groups with domains of discontinuity. *Math. Ann.*, 237(3):253–272, 1978.

[15] Ernst Specker. Endenverbände von Räumen und Gruppen. *Math. Ann.*, 122:167–174, 1950.

[16] John Stallings. *Group theory and three-dimensional manifolds*. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.-London, 1971. A James K. Whittemore Lecture in Mathematics given at Yale University, 1969, Yale Mathematical Monographs, 4.

[17] Pekka Tukia. Convergence groups and Gromov's metric hyperbolic spaces. *New Zealand J. Math.*, 23(2):157–187, 1994.